



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,610	06/08/2001	Hiroyuki Koshino	0051-0155P	6442
2292	7590	08/04/2004		
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
			EXAMINER MORAN, MARJORIE A	
			ART UNIT 1631	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/857,610	Applicant(s) KOSHINO ET AL.	
	Examiner Marjorie A. Moran	Art Unit 1631	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Marjorie A. Moran. (3) _____
 (2) Robert Downs (4) _____

Date of Interview: 7/28/04

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: Proposed claim 1

Identification of prior art discussed: None

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See below.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Mr. Downs and the examiner discussed whether a step of comparison would render the claims statutory, but did not come to an agreement. Possible amendments to overcome 112, 2nd rejection w/ regard to a "precedence rule" and a "linear notation rule" were also discussed. The examiner stated that a method for comparing "sugar" molecules was supported, and probably enabled, by the working example of the specification. Page 24 of the spec., disclosing prediction of an NMP shift, was discussed as it applied to the 35 USC 101 rejection.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Marjorie A. Moran
 Examiner's signature, if required